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Reviewer's report:

Heale et al in their manuscript, "Physicians' Pharmacogenomics Information Needs and Seeking Behavior: A Study with Case Vignettes," add to the body of knowledge of how do we effectively deliver PGX guided care. Important but seemingly obvious theme that is alluded to is the fact that the right amount of information needs to be provided at the right amount of depth to be successful. Heale helps guide us to that sweet spot to answer the ultimate question for the physician "do I really need to do the testing" and "what's the bottom line answer"

Limitations of the study include the number of participants thought think important themes emerge that will help guide future studies in this space and practical delivery of PGX information. For example average of 8 minutes of searching, yet satisfaction of finding a concise conclusion/resolution of whether to pursue testing seemed lacking. The typical primary care physician is unlikely to spend that amount of time searching and will quickly move on if this has to be done in the flow of seeing patients. Important theme is that a bulleted synopsis of the situation is needed for how to effectively use PGX info but also practical information like cost, logistics of actual testing, etc.

Revision Request:

It's not clear why enzyme replacement therapy for Gaucher was included --- seems like an outlier case compared to cases 2 and 3 and thus could get different reactions/results thus skewing results. Most readers probably equate PGX with CYP enzymes etc as opposed to enzyme replacement therapy. Perhaps authors can elaborate on this inclusion and comment on this in the materials and methods and/or discussion sections.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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